

Trust and Identity PAG Minutes - 2018-01-22

Trust and Identity Program Advisory Group Meeting - January 22, 2018

Minutes

Attending: Chris Phillips, Kevin Morooney, Mark Johnson, Ron Kraemer, Klara Jelinkova, Michele Norin, Steve Zoppi, Sean Reynolds

Action Items

(AI) Kevin will email the PAG for any last input on the [Trust and Identity Portfolio matrix](#).

(AI) For the next PAG call, Kevin et al will develop materials that discuss how the parts of the portfolio are currently funded and resourced.

Trust and Identity Portfolio Matrix

Kevin reviewed the latest version of the [Trust and Identity Portfolio matrix](#), and will email the PAG for any last input. Kevin also reported that the other governance and advisory groups within Trust and Identity are having similar discussions about scope and work plans. Kevin will be spending time developing an overall plan based on all of this input.

Ron reported that, based on previous discussions, the main Trust and Identity “big questions” are:

- Defining the T/I Service portfolio
- Understand the T/I funding model
- Developing a T/I roadmap
- Interfederation interoperability
- Communicating with potential community members
- Demonstrating accomplishments

PAG Primer

Kevin continued the review of the “[PAG Primer](#)” from last meeting. The primer provides an overview of the Trust and Identity portfolio.

Comments included:

- eduroam, the Certificate Service, and the Federation all seem to be solidly in the portfolio.
- Does software engineering and development belong in the portfolio? Via TIER, Internet2 is delivering Shibboleth, Grouper, and COmanage in container versions. TIER has created APIs, a user interface for Shibboleth, and other items in these development efforts.

Kevin reviewed the history of software development at Internet2. Internet2’s first investment in software development came in 2006 with \$500,000. That grew to \$900,000 by 2011. With the TIER requirements, Internet2’s software development budget grew to \$1.1 million; the TIER investment was \$1.2 million on top of that.

The question now is whether software engineering should be part of the portfolio and, if so, whether it is sustainable. There was general agreement that work that relates to the provisioning of the services is relevant and useful. The effort should be along the lines of enablement and shared resources, as well as advancing things like “consent,” if it helps resolve the Research and Scholarship attribute release and other federation priorities. There is also merit to accomplishing things that help deployment and installation on smaller campuses.

There was also general agreement that this likely cannot happen if funding returns to the \$1.1 million pre-TIER level.

(AI) For the next PAG call, Kevin et al will develop materials that discuss how the parts of the portfolio are currently funded and resourced.